

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 25 January 2005. Responsive to the rejections and the objection made in the Official Action, Independent Claim 1 has been amended for further prosecution. It is believed that with this amendment to Claim 1, there is a further clarification of the Applicant's invention for this Patent Application. Also, Claims 2-4 and 9 have been amended to improve the language thereof.

Prior to a discussion of the Examiner's rejection made in the outstanding Official Action, it is believed that it may be beneficial to briefly review the subject Patent Application device in light of the inventive concept of the Applicant. The subject Patent Application is directed to a handheld device having Email access function and particularly to a base of a handheld device which provides the handheld device with the ability to access Emails in a computer or on an information network and download the Emails into the handheld device and display the Emails on the display screen of the handheld device.

The base for the handheld device receives the handheld device therein and provides an electrical connection between the handheld device and a control circuit board 12 held by the base 2. The data exchange is accomplished between the handheld device and the control circuit board 12 through engagement of the electric contacts 13 of the

control circuit board and electric contacts 101 of the handheld device. The control circuit board 12 is connected to a computer 3 through wired or wireless transmission interfaces.

The control circuit board 12 comprises a control unit 21, a memory unit 22 controlled by the control unit 21, a transmission unit 23, and Email discrimination unit 24. The transmission unit 23 is an interface unit for digital information exchange between the control unit 21 and the network 41, 42. The transmission unit 23 can download the Email data packages of the Email 5 via the network 41, 42.

The control unit 21 positioned on the control circuit board 12 is used to receive control commands of the handheld device 1 to download the Email data package of the Email 5 and/or to transfer the data content of the Email 5 to the handheld device 1.

The memory unit 22 of the control circuit board 12 is controlled by the control unit 21 and contains the software for downloading the Email 5 as well as the downloaded Email 5 which are stored in the memory unit 22. The memory unit 22 is used for storing a plurality of mails where each mail comprises a mail data storage area, a mail index area, and mail's appended file format area.

The mail discrimination unit 24 on the control circuit board 12 is used to discriminate the content and format of the Email 5 prior to storing the latter in the memory unit 22. The mail discrimination unit 24 comprises a mail buffer 241 for temporarily storing the data of the Email 5. The mail discrimination unit 24 discriminates and classifies the content of the Email 5 into mail full text data, mail index

data, and mail's appended file data. The object of the classifying the Email 5 in the mail discrimination unit 24 is to prevent possible crash of the handheld device due to insufficient memory thereof.

Turning now to the objection and rejections made in the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 1 due to a minor informality found therein; Claims 1-3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami, U.S. Patent #6,657,654; Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami in view of Watanabe, et al., U.S. Patent #6,763,458; and Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswami in view of Horvitz, et al., U.S. Patent #6,161,130.

Responsive to the objection made to Claim 1, Claim 1 has been amended to correct the informality found therein by the Examiner. It is believed therefore that the objection to Claim 1 is obviated.

Narayanaswami, the reference cited by the Examiner, is directed to a camera assembly for use with personal digital assistants (PDAs) for capturing video and still images. The still and video camera described in Narayanaswami is attached to a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) and incorporates a high speed communication link between the PDA and a processor, such as a PC. Specifically, the system disclosed in Narayanaswami includes a PDA 100 and an interface adapter, e.g., a cradle 112 having a camera assembly 116. The PDA 100 includes a housing 102 having a display 104 and

control button. Housing 102 provides a structure for coupling PDA 100 to the cradle 112.

The cradle 112 includes a camera assembly 116 incorporated therein. Camera assembly 116 provides video and still images in conjunction with PDA 100. A high speed communication cable 134 is used to transfer data, programs and images from camera assembly 116 and PDA 100 to a PC 136 and vice-versa. PDA 100 includes an interface 138 for coupling a connector 140 of the cradle 112 thereto.

As shown in Fig. 4 of Narayanaswami, the camera assembly 116 includes electronics having components found in digital cameras, such as an imager chip 202, A/D converter 204, and an image compressor 206. The system utilizes the power of a CPU 208 located in PDA 100.

The PDA includes memory 210, and the camera assembly 116 includes memory 212, as shown in Fig. 4. The software stored in memory 212 is used to manipulate an image acquired by camera assembly 116 to perform operations such as changing sizes, aspect ratio, cropping, changing colors and brightness and other special effects. In the still camera mode, the pictures are stored within memory 210 on PDA 100 to better utilize resources and minimize camera costs.

In the conferencing mode, when assembly 116 and PDA 100 are used for video conferencing, the picture of the subject will appear on display 104 of PDA 100. In this mode, the image data is transferred from camera assembly 116 to display 104 on PDA

100 and may also be transferred to PC 136 via cable 134. Software on PC 136 functions to perform the video conferencing tasks such as transmitting and receiving images over an Internet connection or a phone line, dialing up and initialization, selection of frame size and frame rate, etc.

It is respectfully submitted that Narayanaswami fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious the subject which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically,

A. Narayanaswami, in contradistinction to the present invention, is specifically intended for capturing images by a camera used with a PDA and transmitting video and still images to and from personal computers. Nowhere does Narayanaswami disclose other functions or applications of the disclosed system. As such, the system of Narayanaswami is limited specifically to the image capturing by the camera 116 attachable to the PDA.

Optics, software and hardware of Narayanaswami are intended only for image capturing. Indeed, as mentioned in Column 5, Lines 22-62 in Narayanaswami, the camera assembly 116 includes electronics having components found in digital cameras (imager chip, A/D converter, image compressor). The software used in the system is specifically for manipulation of images acquired by camera assembly 116 to perform operations such as changing size, aspect ratio, changing colors and brightness, etc. of the images. The arrangement disclosed in Narayanaswami is not intended and therefore may not be used for other functions, such as, for example, Email access and processing.

While the present invention is specifically directed to a handheld device with Email access function. The entire arrangement of the present invention is designed particularly for this purpose. It has nothing to do with the video images capturing and conferencing, but quite to the contrary, deals exclusively with Email access functionality.

It is respectfully submitted that the suggestion of the Examiner that “an artisan working with the invention of Narayanaswami dealing with the use of a cradle having a control circuit and a memory in expanding the limited memory and other functionality of devices such as a PDA to function as a camera to scan digital pictures to perform video conferencing among other functionalities by making use of a cradle would have been optimistic that expanding functionality of the PDA by making use of a cradle/base would motivate the artisan that such an invention would also benefit in making use of Email function eliminating the problem of limited memory resource of the PDA,” somewhat puzzles the Applicant since it is not clear how “obvious” it is to switch from capturing images to Emails in the functionality of handheld devices. It is respectfully submitted that the art of capturing images is quite distant from Email domain. It would not be obvious to an artisan proficient in still and video cameras to be motivated to expand the teachings of Narayanaswami to Email accessing, downloading and transmitting environment.

B. Further, Narayanaswami reference suggests that the camera assembly 116 may include memory 212, while the PDA includes memory 210. The memory 212

includes software stored therein which is used to manipulate images acquired by camera assembly 116 to perform operations such as changing size, aspect ratio, changing colors and brightness, and other special optical effects. Memory 212 however does not include software for transmitting and receiving images over an Internet. This function is performed by PC 136 which has a software functioning to perform the video conferencing tasks such as transmitting and receiving images over an Internet connection (Column 5, Lines 58-62).

In the present invention, in contrast to Narayanaswami, the memory unit 22 positioned on the control circuit board of the base 2 includes not only data content of the downloaded Email 5, but also include a program for downloading the Email 5 (Page 5, the last paragraph).

C. Further, in Narayanaswami, in contrast to the present invention, the images are stored within memory 210 on PDA 100. The images are not stored in the memory 212 of the camera assembly 116.

Additionally in the present invention, the memory unit 22 which stores the content of the downloaded Email 5 is located not in the handheld device 1, but on the control circuit board 12 of the base 2.

D. Narayanaswami, in opposition to the present invention, provides for CPU 208 – a control unit – to be located in the PDA 100. No control unit is disposed in the cradle.

In the present invention, the control unit 21 is located not in the handheld device 1, but is a part of the control circuit board 12 of the base 2.

E. Additionally, in Narayanaswami, in contrast to the present invention, the transmission of the video images over the Internet is controlled by the software running in PC 136.

Opposingly in the present invention, the program for downloading the Email 5 is stored in the memory unit 22 which is located on the control circuit board of the base 2.

It is respectfully submitted that Narayanaswami does not – and is not intended to – have Email access functionality and due to such a fundamental difference with the system of the present invention, Narayanaswami fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious:

A. A handheld device having Email access function,

B. A control unit disposed in the control circuit board of the base to download the Email data package of the Email and to transfer the content of the Email to the handheld device;

C. A memory unit disposed on said control circuit board and controlled by said control unit, wherein Email access program and accessed data of the Emails are stored in the memory unit.

The differences in intended functions between Narayanaswami and the system of the present invention strongly determine differences in designs of camera for use with

personal digital assistants of Narayanaswami and the handheld device having Email access function of the present invention.

Since Narayanaswami is not intended for Email access functionality, his camera does not include the above listed elements which are now clearly emphasized in Claim 1 as amended. As Narayanaswami fails to disclose each and every of the claimed elements, it cannot anticipate the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed in Claim 1, and does not render the invention of the subject Patent Application obvious.

It is not clear to expand the functionality of the personal digital assistant having picture capturing capability of Narayanaswami into the Email functionality domain. Arguendo, even if the suggestion of the Examiner to modify Narayanaswami to include Email function because "...video is one of many conferencing formats including Emails..." is taken into account, it is believed that the combination of elements, as now claimed by Applicant in Claim 1, provides patentable distinction over the resulting system.

Independent Claim 1 as now amended teaches (inter alia):

a memory unit disposed on said control circuit board and controlled by the control unit, wherein the memory unit contains Email access program and accessed data of the Emails stored therein, and

a control unit disposed on the control circuit board and controlled by the handheld device to download the Email data package of the Email and to transfer the

content of the Email to the handheld device. The claimed combination of elements as claimed in Claim 1 is simply not found for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Application even if Narayanaswami is modified as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, the patentability of the subject Patent Application as now claimed in Claim 1 is believed; and the allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully urged over Narayanaswami Patent cited by the Examiner.

Watanabe, et al., another reference cited by the Examiner, is directed to a system and method for installing and servicing an operating system in a computer and permits a user to select and execute one of a plurality of operating systems available on the device at the time of powering on the device.

Watanabe, et al. describes in Column 29, Line 56 – Column 30, Line 9, the process by which the mail agent program in memory downloads the user's Email and stores it in a compatible partition of the computer. A common format for this, known to those skilled in the art, is to create or append to a sequential file of mail content and to create or append the sequential index file. The reference defines the mail index file as a sequence of records where one record corresponds to one message in the mail content file. The record may also contain other information regarding the reception of the message.

It is respectfully submitted that although Watanabe, et al. discloses creation of mail index for storing index records and appended file format area for storing the

appended files, as a part of Email communications, this Patent fails however to suggest, disclose, or render obvious any reference to a base of handheld device having Email access function which would include a casing with a control circuit board received therein, or

a control unit disposed on the control circuit board and controlled by the handheld device to download the Email data package of the Email or to transfer the content of the Email to the handheld device, or

a memory unit disposed on the control circuit board controlled by the control unit, where the memory unit contains a mail access program and accessed data of the Email stored therein, or

a transmission unit disposed on the control circuit board of the base and used for digital information exchange between the control circuit board and the computer or the information network.

Horvitz, et al., another reference cited by the Examiner, is directed to a system that implements a method which through a probabilistic classifier detects Email messages in an incoming message stream which a recipient is likely to consider "junk" messages. Specifically, Horvitz, et al. Patent describes a system which discriminates message content for the recipient through a probabilistic classifier, e.g., a support vector machine, trained on prior content classification. Through a quantitative probability measure, produced by the classifier for each message, in an incoming message stream, the system

classifies the message for its recipient into one of a plurality of different classes, e.g., either spam (non-legitimate) or legitimate mail.

Horvitz, et al., although describing a feature of discriminating and classifying Email messages, fails however to express any relation to added Email access function of a handheld device which has a casing with a control circuit board received therein, or a control unit disposed on the control circuit board for controlling downloading of Email data package of the Email into handheld device, or

a memory unit disposed on the control circuit board which would include Email access program and the accessed data of the Email, or

a transmission unit used for exchange between the control circuit board of the handheld device and the computer or the information network.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner, either Narayanaswami, or Watanabe, et al., or Horvitz, et al., taken singly or in any combination thereof, disclose a base of handheld device having Email access function, which includes a casing having a control circuit board received therein with a control unit disposed on the control circuit board and controlled by the handheld device to download the Email data package of the Email or to transfer the content of the Email to the handheld device; or

a memory unit disposed on the control circuit board controlled by the control unit, wherein the memory unit includes Email access programs stored therein, and stores the accessed data of the Email.

There is no motivation to combine Horvitz, et al. (which is not handheld device, and which merely discloses a discriminator or classifier for Email messages) or Watanabe, et al. (which fails to have any relation to a handheld device with Email access function and which merely discloses mail index storing index record and creating of an append format and storing appended files) with Narayanaswami which not only fails to pertain to a system having Email access functionality, but also fails to have a control unit associated with the cradle or a memory unit associated with a cradle which would include software allowing conferencing function of the information between the handheld device and a PC.

Arguendo, even if the teachings of Horvitz, et al. and Watanabe, et al. are combined with Narayanaswami, it is believed that the combination of elements as now claimed by Applicant in Claim 1, still provides patentable distinctions over the resulting structure. The allowance of Claim 1, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9, as dependent on Claim 1, are believed to add further limitations that are patentably distinct in addition to being dependent upon what is now believed to be a patentable base Claim, and, therefore, allowable for at least the same reasons.

MR2349-791

Application Serial No. 10/072,927

Responsive to Office Action dated 25 January 2005

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Morton J. Rosenberg".

Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration #26,049

Dated: 4/25/05

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
410-465-6678